

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar. The amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into a substitute specification and abstract. Attached are two versions of the substitute specification and abstract, a marked-up version showing the revisions, as well as a clean version. No new matter has been added.

II. Amendments to the Claims

Independent claims 1, 9 and 10 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below. Support for these amendments can be found, at least, in Fig. 2 and the related description of the invention included in the specification (e.g., pages 9-11 of the specification).

It is also noted that claims 1-18 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should

not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Vialle (EP 1359684). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 9 and 10 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites receiving pieces of channel information from a first receiver and a second receiver, such that the first receiver performs a MIMO communication with a first transmitter through a first channel, the second receiver performs the MIMO communication with a second transmitter other than the first transmitter through a second channel other than the first channel, the first receiver receives signals from the second transmitter through a third channel other than the first channel, and the second receiver receives signals from the first transmitter through a fourth channel other than the second channel. In addition, claim 1 recites collectively estimating statuses of the first, second, third and fourth channels in accordance with the received pieces of channel information. Vialle fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Rather, as noted on page 2 of the Office Action, Vialle merely teaches that each rake receiver receives coefficients from FIR filters 5 (see Figs. 3 and 4, and paragraphs [0024] and [0025]). More specifically, Vialle teaches that each rake receiver includes a combiner 20/21 and a despreader/descrambler 18/19, such that the despreader/descrambler 18/19 of each rake receiver receives coefficients from the FIR filters 5 (see Figs. 3 and 4, and paragraph [0025]).

Thus, in view of the above, although Vialle teaches that a despreader/descrambler of each rake receiver receives coefficients, Vialle still fails to disclose or suggest receiving pieces of channel information from a first receiver and a second receiver, such that the first receiver performs a MIMO communication with a first transmitter through a first channel, the second receiver performs the MIMO communication with a second transmitter other than the first transmitter through a second channel other than the first channel, the first receiver receives signals from the second transmitter through a third channel other than the first channel, and the second receiver receives signals from the first transmitter through a fourth channel other than the second channel, as recited in claim 1.

In other words, even though Vialle teaches a communication structure wherein coefficients are received by respective rake filters, Vialle fails to disclose or suggest the specific communication structure of the plurality of receivers, as required by claim 1, such that (i) the first receiver performs a MIMO communication with a first transmitter through a first channel and receives signals from the second transmitter through a third channel other than the first channel, and (ii) the second receiver performs the MIMO communication with a second transmitter other than the first transmitter through a second channel other than the first channel and receives signals from the first transmitter through a fourth channel other than the second channel.

Furthermore, for reasons similar to those discussed above, it is also evident that Vialle fails to disclose or suggest collectively estimating statuses of the first, second, third and fourth channels in accordance with the received pieces of channel information, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 2-8 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Vialle.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Vialle or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Vialle to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-8 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 9 and 10 are directed to an apparatus and a system, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 9 and 10 and claims 11-18 that depend therefrom are allowable over Vialle.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 2, 3, 6-8, 11, 12 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vialle in view of various combinations of Walton (U.S. 2003/0125040) and Aldajani (U.S. 7,415,285) (secondary references).

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that these secondary references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claims 1, 9 and 10 which are lacking from the Vialle reference. Therefore, no obvious combination of Vialle with any of the secondary references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claims 1, 9 and 10 and claims 2-8 and 11-18 that depend therefrom.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Junji KONDO et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2010.01.22 12:57:41 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap

Registration No. 60,554

Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 22, 2010